

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 were pending. Claims 1, 12-19, 29-37, and 44-45 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-45 remain pending.

In the present Office Action, paragraph 3 indicates claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,394 (hereinafter "Bamforth"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,455,865 (hereinafter "Perlman"). In addition, paragraph 4 indicates each of claims 12, 13, 30-31 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth and Perlman, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,568 (hereinafter "Ginter"). Applicant respectfully traverses at least some of the above rejections and requests reconsideration.

Not All Claims Are Addressed in the Office Action

Applicant notes that claim 36 is nowhere addressed, either directly or indirectly, nor are its features addressed, anywhere in the present Office Action as required by M.P.E.P. § 707.7(i). Accordingly, Applicant submits the present Office Action is not complete as required by M.P.E.P. § 707.

Features Not Taught or Suggested by the Cited Art

Applicant submits each of the pending claims recite features neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. For example, claim 1 recites a method including:

“converting a message received from a sender into an internal format comprising at least an attribute part and a data part[,];
writing into said attribute part data extracted from said received message and data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received; and
routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part.”

Applicant submits at least the above highlighted features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. In contrast, Bamforth teaches the following:

“As shown in FIG. 4, conversion engine 203 first receives an Edifact or other variable field message, typically including protocol information, from a CRS or other computer system (step 401). It may determine a type of the message based on predefined criteria such as, for example, requirements for the Edifact protocol. Conversion engine 203 reads a segment or field in the message (step 402), and it determines or identifies the type of data in that segment or field (step 403). The determination or identification may involve using the type of message, and it may also involve downloading predefined software functions from function library 202 to analyze particular message segments or fields. Conversion engine 203 determines the location of that type of data in the corresponding fixed format message (step 404), which is typically predefined so that it knows the structure and format of that type of message. Conversion engine 203 may also remove unnecessary protocol information from the data (step 405). The protocol information is generally not required in the fixed format message, as the size and data type of the fields may be predefined or known. Conversion engine 203 assembles fixed format message and maps data from the Edifact or other variable field message to the fields in the fixed format message (step 406) by positioning the data, typically without the protocol information, in the corresponding fields for that data in the fixed format message.” (Bamforth, col. 6, lines 32-56).

Consequently, Bamforth does not teach or suggest the above highlighted features of claim 1. Further, none of the cited art teaches the above highlighted features, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, because each of independent claims 15-19, 37, and 44-45 include similar features, each of these claims are believed patentable over the cited art for similar reasons. Further, because each of the dependent claims include at least the features of the above independent claims upon which they depend, each of the dependent claims are patentable as well.

Still further, Applicant submits the dependent claims recite additional features neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Note at least the following examples:

Claim 13 recites the additional features “utilizing a transaction identifier associated with the message to determine whether there exists a previously stored context which indicates a state of the transaction; and creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no context exists for the message.”

Claim 14 further recites “wherein the transaction comprises a series of messages, and wherein the method further comprises updating a context associated with the transaction as the series of messages are processed.”

None of the cited art teaches or suggests the above features.

CONCLUSION


Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-77301/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: October 28, 2004